



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,767	04/01/2004	Randy Salo	000476C1	2795

23696 7590 10/23/2006
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED
5775 MOREHOUSE DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER

PRIETO, BEATRIZ

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/816,767

Applicant(s)

SALO ET AL.

Examiner

Prieto B.

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-21 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in Amendment filed //23/06, claims 1-5, 7-21 have been examined and remain pending.

2. Objection to claims 9, 16 and 21 containing the use of a trademark/trade name a “Microsoft® Windows CE device” has been obviated by amendments thereto, thus are hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejection under 103

3. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action may be found in previous office action.

4. Claims 1-5, 7-9, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jammes et. al. (US 6,484,149 B1) (referred to as Jammes hereafter) in view of Gregg et. al. (US 6,516,416 B2) (referred to as Gregg hereafter) in further view of (US 5,987,480) Donohue et. al. (referred to a Donohue hereafter).

Regarding claim 1, Jammes teaches a system as shown on Figs. 1-3, comprising:

the remote device having browser (102) capabilities to accommodate a request inputted by a “subscriber” user to access the “subscriber information” data (col 9/lines 1-8; col 6/lines 17-20, 41-58, user input see col 21/lines 11-14), said a “remote access” device (102) communicated via a “data” network (104). (Fig. 1, col 8/lines 34-41);

a “an application gateway” server (106) hosting the subscriber information (col 12/lines 1-10, col 6/lines 22-30 and information including col 6/lines 66-col 7/line 7), the application gateway server comprising:

a navigation module (350/352) for receiving data in a predetermined (e.g. HTTP and/or URL) format (see Fig. 3, col 17/lines 55-58) and accessing information (called “device specific”) associated with said received data (col 9/lines 1-10, col 7/lines 8-17, 30-39, col 12/lines 1-10);

a data module (114) for obtaining (e.g. said subscriber) information requested (325/324 of Fig. 3, col 29/lines 29-38) and passing said subscriber information to the navigation module (Fig. 3, col 9/lines 10-21, 45-51, 65-66, col 8/lines 46-67 and col 16/lines 42-49);

a rendering module for obtaining “requisite browser” displayable data based on desired action (e.g. subscriber’s request) (col 43/lines 55-63) and current state associated with said session (col 50/lines 1-30), including converting (354) requested subscriber information to a format specific to subscriber device specific format e.g. client readable format (col 7/lines 15-65) and

verifying subscriber identity using information inputted by the subscriber, including name, password or cookie (col 49/lines 15-32); however Jammes does not explicitly teach means (“session module”) for maintaining “temporary” data about the subscriber, and where data provided by the rendering module is used by the navigation module to modify said received data for providing to said remote data access;

Gregg disclosure within the invention’s field of endeavor, teaches a hosting server including a session (52) module (col 7/lines 42-47) for maintaining session related data (i.e. “temporary data”) associated with a subscriber’s session(s) (col 5/lines 21-24 & col 11/lines 19-30), and for communicating/interacting with a subscription access server (34) receiving subscriber access requests (col 6/lines 41-45), session data including temporary data regarding a session (col 12/lines 1-13, 60-62); further teaching

a rendering module (74) for obtaining data based on desired action (e.g. apply for a different subscription) and current state (e.g. existing subscriber) (col 8/lines 39-67), the obtained data including browser related data “requisite” (col 36/lines 32-38);

an authentication module associated with said data source module for verifying subscriber credentials (authenticates: col 4/lines 50-54, validates or verifies; col 6/lines 26-31 based on subscriber information “credentials”; col 6/lines 66-col 7/line 27); however Gregg does not teach where data provided by the rendering module is used by the navigation module to modify said received data for providing to said remote data access; AND

Jammes does not teach claim limitation as presently added/amended where the accessed information (called “device specific information”) is about/of the remote access device and the

Art Unit: 2142

reformatting of requested information is particularly “based on the information regarding the user’s remote access device”.

Donohue teaches a module receiving a data, specifically, receiving requested data for said remote access device retrieved by a script (module) (col 5/lines 63-67);

a module that retrieves (interacts) screen data from a storage, specifically, wherein the “screen” data associated with to said requested data by remote access device is stored in a directory structure storage (col 5/lines 24-51, col 10/lines 17-19) is selected by a script (module) (col 5/lines 63-67), where said screen data selectively corresponding to said requested data by remote access device based on said device specific information (col 10/lines 43-48, col 12/lines 27-38) and using the screen data to reformat said data, thus based on said device specific information (col 9/lines 40-53, wherein particularly screen data including instructions for reformatting (converting) to another “second” format (e.g. image graphics) said data see col 15/lines 30-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made given the teachings of Donohue stemming from disclosure thereon, and the use of a plurality of scripts implemented in an object-oriented language is suggested to perform the functionalities described thereon, the touted advantages of object-oriented programming, such as modularity, polymorphism, and reuse, which allows development of applications and services in modular manner running on single/multiple node system would be readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art. One would be motivated by the teachings of Donohue to apply these to the system in Jammes and thus solve the problem for web sites developers to design web pages compatible with the multiplicity of types of browsers by automatically providing content compatible with the specific type and/or version of the browser used on the client’s remote access device reducing the time and inconvenience to the process of browsing the web noted by Donohue in the prior art and support the customization of content to the user.

Regarding claims 2-3, a database associated with said data source module (114 of Fig. 3), wherein said authentication module compares user data with user stored data, said user stored data being stored on said database (Gregg: authenticates: col 4/lines 50-54, validates or verifies; col 6/lines 26-31 based on subscriber information “credentials”; col 6/lines 66-col 7/line 27) and

Art Unit: 2142

wherein said predetermined format comprises data in URL format (Jammes: Fig. 3, col 17/lines 55-58).

Regarding claim 4, wherein said subscriber information comprises enterprise specific information (Jammes: col 6/lines 32-40 and Gregg: col 1/lines 20-27).

Regarding claim 5, said navigation module extracts an action request from said data in the predetermined format (Jammes: col 17/lines 55-61), passes the action request to the data source module which retrieves any necessary information based upon the action request (Jammes: col 17/lines 61-col 18/line 15); and said navigation module retrieves a "browser specific screen" data corresponding to the action request from the rendering module (Jammes: col 7/lines 15-65 and Gregg: col 36/lines 32-38).

Regarding claims 7-9, the ability to receive information and data requests in remote access device specific formats and convert said information and data requests into data packets (Jammes: col 7/lines 15-65, col 17/line 61-col 18/line 15) and wherein the data network comprises the Internet (Jammes: col 5/lines 48-52, col 6/lines 14-21), wherein the data network comprises a dedicated network connection (Jammes: col 5/lines 48-52), and wherein the remote access device comprises a personal computer (Gregg: col 9/lines 1-15).

Regarding claim 17, this claim is substantially the same as limitations discussed on claims 1, 3, 10-11, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 18, wherein verified credentials some reside on a (called "enterprise") database (Gregg: authenticates: col 4/lines 50-54, validates or verifies; col 6/lines 26-31 based on subscriber information "credentials"; col 6/lines 66-col 7/line 27).

Regarding claims 19-20, substantially the same as limitations in claims 1, 3, 10-11, same rationale of rejection is applicable and wherein said navigation module parses said URL

Art Unit: 2142

subscriber request into identifiable segments, at least one segment comprising a requested action (Jammes; col 17/lines 55-col 18/line 5).

Regarding claim 21, this claim is substantially the same as claim 4, discussed above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

5. Claims 10-16 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jammes in view of Gregg (US 6,515,416) and Donohue (US 5,987,480)

Regarding claim 10, as discussed on claim 1, same rationale is/are applicable, further comprising the steps of

receiving a “subscriber information” request in a predetermined format (e.g. HTTP and/URL) (Jammes: see Fig. 3, col 17/lines 55-58);

“navigating the access and transmission” parsing or scanning and/or analyzing the requested subscriber information (Jammes; col 17/lines 55-col 18/line 5),

said transmission of the requested subscriber information being in a “subscriber device specific” predetermined format (Jammes: see Fig. 3, col 17/lines 55-58); said access and transmission navigating step comprising:

“compiling” gathering or collecting subscriber information based on said subscriber information request (Gregg: col 8/lines 39-67 and col 36/lines 32-38);

“assembling” processing and displaying said subscriber information into a “device specific format” associated with the subscriber device, wherein said predetermined format for said subscriber information request differs from said subscriber device specific predetermined format (Jammes: device specific format conversion col 7/lines 15-65 and browser type data col 36/lines 32-38); and

transmitting the assembled and rendered subscriber information to said subscriber device (Jammes: col 20/lines 45-col 21/lines 64, rendering accessed/retrieved content, col 6/lines 40-45) and

retrieving screen data based on the said subscriber information request (Donohue: col 5/lines 24-51) including wherein the “screen” data corresponding to said requested data by remote access device is stored in a directory structure storage (col 5/lines 24-51, col 10/lines 17-19) is selected by a script (module) (col 5/lines 63-67).

Regarding claim 11, a database associated with said data source module (114 of Fig. 3), wherein said authentication module compares user data with user stored data, said user stored data being stored on said database (Gregg: authenticates: col 4/lines 50-54, validates or verifies; col 6/lines 26-31 based on subscriber information “credentials”; col 6/lines 66-col 7/line 27) and wherein said predetermined format comprises data in URL format (Jammes: Fig. 3, col 17/lines 55-58).

said navigation module extracts an action request from said data in the predetermined format (Jammes: col 17/lines 55-61), passes the action request to the data source module which retrieves any necessary information based upon the action request (Jammes: col 17/lines 61-col 18/line 15); and said navigation module retrieves a “browser specific screen” data corresponding to the action request from the rendering module (Jammes: col 7/lines 15-65 and Gregg: col 36/lines 32-38).

Regarding claim 12, parsing said subscriber information into an action task and a page specific task, and compiling content data based on the information identified on the parsing step (Jammes; col 17/lines 55-col 18/line 5).

Regarding claim 13, verifying user credentials using information maintained with subscriber information at a (called local) database (Gregg: authenticates: col 4/lines 50-54, validates or verifies; col 6/lines 26-31 based on subscriber information “credentials”; col 6/lines 66-col 7/line 27).

Regarding claims 14 and 16, wherein said subscriber information comprises enterprise specific information (Jammes: col 6/lines 32-40 and Gregg: col 1/lines 20-27).

Art Unit: 2142

Regarding claim 15, compiling comprises seeking requested information from a ("local") database (Jammes; col 17/lines 55-col 18/line 5).

Citation of Pertinent Art:

6. The following prior art made of record and relied for the basis of obviousness and/or the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made and/or considered pertinent prior art to applicant's disclosure. Copies of Non-Patent Literature documents cited will be provided as set forth in MPEP§ 707.05(a):

US 5,933,816

Zeanah, et. al. teaches using screen data (templates) to reformat data requested for a remote client device, where the screen reformats said data based on device specific information, such as the type of browser used on the client's device.

Response to Arguments

7. Regarding claims 1, 10 and 17 rejected as being unpatentable over Jammes in view of Gregg, it is argued (p. 9 of remarks) that the applied prior art does not teach added limitation, a formatting data using screen templates.

In response to the above-mentioned argument, applicant's interpretation of the applied prior art has fully considered. Navigation module 502 therefore hands off the request for a particular screen, email headers, title inbox, and so forth, to the rendering module 504, which locates the appropriate screen in the screen bank 506 and locates the necessary template, fills the template with the data provided by the navigation module 502, and passes the completed screen to the navigation module. Rendering module 504 may hold hundreds of screens, including several screen 8510s for the various types of user devices available. Rendering module 502 determines the type of browser being used by reading the header associated with the URL received and determines whether the device is a Netscape browser (if the word "mozilla" appears

Art Unit: 2142

in the header), a Windows CE device if a Windows CE browser, and so forth. Once the type of device has been identified, that information is passed to render to retrieve and compile the appropriate information for transmission [see 0075]. Once the navigation module has compiled the requisite information from the session module, rendering module, and data access module, the browser specific data is sent back through interface module 501 and to the device [see 0078].

Claimed clause “wherein said rendering module interacts with said navigation module to cause said navigation module to reformat said data for said remote access device based on said device specific information”, has been fully considered. Added clause has been interpreted [AS BEST UNDERSTOOD], “wherein said rendering module communicates with said navigation module using browser specific information provided by the rendering module modifies the response data for said remote access device in accordance with said browser specific information obtained using screen data (i.e. templates).

Donohue teaches wherein the “screen” data corresponding to said requested data by remote access device is stored in a directory structure storage see col 5/lines 24-51, col 10/lines 17-19; screen data is selected by a script (module) see col 5/lines 63-67; receiving requested data for said remote access device retrieved by a script (module) see col 5/lines 63-67; said data in a predetermined format, see col 6/lines 17-21; and selecting said screen data corresponding to said requested data by remote access device based on said device specific information, see col 10/lines 43-48, col 12/lines 27-38; and using the screen data to reformat said data, thus based on said device specific information, see col 9/lines 40-53; wherein screen data including instructions for reformatting said data, such as converting to graphical image format see col 15/lines 30-38.

Arguments that the applied prior art does not teach formatting data using screen templates has been fully considered but not found persuasive

8. Applicant’s arguments filed 08/23/06 have been fully considered but not rendered persuasive.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Reply to a final rejection or action must include cancellation of, or appeal from the rejection of, each rejected claim. If any claim stands allowed, the reply to a final rejection or action must comply with any requirements or objections as to form (see 1.113). If prosecution in an application is closed, an applicant may request continued examination of the application by filing a submission and the fee set forth in § 1.17(e) prior to the earliest of: (c) A submission as used in this section includes, but is not limited to, an information disclosure statement, an amendment to the written description, claims, or drawings, new arguments, or new evidence in support of patentability. If reply to an Office action under 35 USC 132 is outstanding, the submission must meet the reply requirements of § 1.111 (see MPEP 706.07).

11. An amendment filed after final rejection is not entered as a matter of right and must be filed in compliance with 37 CFR 1.116 or 1.312, respectively (see MPEP 201). An amendment that will place the application either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be admitted. Amendments complying with objections or requirements as to form are to be permitted after final action in accordance with 37 CFR 1.116(a) (see MPEP 706.07(e)) may also be admitted. Except where an amendment merely cancels claims, adopts examiner suggestions, removes issues for appeal, or in some other way requires only a cursory review by the examiner, compliance with the requirement of a showing under 37 CFR 1.116(c) is expected in all amendments after final rejection (see MPEP 714.13). An amendment filed at any time after final rejection, but before an appeal brief is filed, may be entered upon or after filing of an appeal brief

Art Unit: 2142

provided the total effect of the amendment is to (A) remove issues for appeal, and/or (B) adopt examiner suggestions (MPEP 714.13 see also MPEP § 1207 and § 1211).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prieto, B. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3902. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 5:30 to 2:00 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Andrew T. Caldwell can be reached at (571) 272-3868. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, status information for published application may be obtained from either Private or Public PAIR, for unpublished application Private PAIR only (see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov> or the Electronic Business Center at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand carried or delivered to:

Customer Service Window located at the Randolph Bldg.
401 Dulany St.
Alexandria, VA 22314

Faxed to the Central Fax Office:

Fax: (571) 273-8300 or
Telephone: (571) 272-2100 for TC 2100 Customer Service Office.


BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER